

1

2

3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6

7 In re Facebook Biometric Information  
8 Privacy Litigation

Case No. [15-cv-03747-JD](#)

9

10 **ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE  
11 MOTIONS TO SEAL**

12

Re: Dkt. Nos. 208, 211

13

14

This order resolves the pending administrative motions to file documents under seal in this case, as well as the identical motions in the related case *Gullen v. Facebook*, 16-cv-937-JD, Dkt. Nos. 78, 81.

15

**I. GOVERNING STANDARD**

16

17

18

In our circuit, in evaluating a motion to seal, two different standards apply depending on whether the request is being made in connection with a dispositive motion or a non-dispositive motion.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

For dispositive motions, the historic, “strong presumption of access to judicial records” fully applies, and a party seeking sealing must establish “compelling reasons” to overcome that presumption. *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-80 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1136 (9th Cir. 2003)). This standard presents a “high threshold,” and “a ‘good cause’ showing will not, without more, satisfy” it. *Id.* at 1180 (citations omitted). When ordering sealing in this context, the district court must also “articulate the rationale underlying its decision to seal.” *Apple Inc. v. Psystar Corp.*, 658 F.3d 1150, 1162 (9th Cir. 2011).

27

28

The non-dispositive motion context is different. There, “the usual presumption of the public’s right of access is rebutted,” the “public has less of a need for access to court records

1 attached only to non-dispositive motions,” and the “public policies that support the right of access  
2 to dispositive motions, and related materials, do not apply with equal force to non-dispositive  
3 materials.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179-80 (citations omitted). In that context, materials may be  
4 sealed so long as the party seeking sealing makes a “particularized showing” under the “good  
5 cause” standard of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). *Id.* at 1180 (quoting *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at  
6 1138). In either case, however, “[a]n unsupported assertion of ‘unfair advantage’ to competitors  
7 without explaining ‘how a competitor would use th[e] information to obtain an unfair advantage’  
8 is insufficient.” *Hodes v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-01128-WHO, 2013 WL 6070408, at \*2 (N.D.  
9 Cal. Nov. 18, 2013) (quoting *Dunbar v. Google, Inc.*, No. 5:12-cv-003305-LHK, 2012 WL  
10 6202719, at \*4-5 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2013)).

11 In our district, in addition to meeting the applicable standard under *Kamakana*, all parties  
12 requesting sealing must also comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5, including that rule’s requirement  
13 that the request must “establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable  
14 as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law,” *i.e.*, is “sealable.” Civil L.R.  
15 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable  
16 material.” *Id.*

## 17       **II.     DISCUSSION**

18 Both of the pending motions are associated with a non-dispositive discovery dispute, so the  
19 “good cause” standard applies.

### 20       **A.     Facebook’s Motion (Dkt. No. 208).**

21 <b>Dkt. No.</b>	22 <b>Portion of Document Sealed</b>	23 <b>Reason for Sealing</b>	24 <b>Granted/Denied</b>
25       209-3	26       Facebook’s Discovery Letter Brief, 27                   Exhibit C.	28       Confidential designation by plaintiffs. Dkt. No. 208. Plaintiffs have been notified per Civil L.R. 79-5.	<b>Denied.</b> Plaintiffs did not file a responsive declaration explaining why the material is sealable. Further, there is not good cause to seal the information and the request is not narrowly tailored.

1                   **B. Plaintiffs' Motion (Dkt. No. 211).**

Dkt. No.	Portion of Document Sealed	Reason for Sealing	Granted/Denied
212-2	Plaintiffs' discovery letter brief -- Portion of page 2.	This portion of plaintiffs' discovery letter brief contains statements attributed to a company executive during a private meeting about plans for rolling out a new feature of Facebook's service. Dkt. No. 212 ¶ 5-6	<b>Denied.</b> No good cause has been shown to seal this information. The mere fact that these statements are purportedly made by a company executive during a private meeting does not constitute good cause.

11                  **III. CONCLUSION**

12                  The parties should file unredacted versions of the documents within 7 days of this order.

13                  **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14                  Dated: August 29, 2017

15  
16  
17                    
18                  JAMES DONATO  
19                  United States District Judge